

PM2.5 SIP Public Comment Hearing

Logan, Utah

October 15, 2012

11:00 AM

Hearing Officer: Kathy Van Dame

1. Lynn Lemon, Cache County Executive. What I'd like to do is, I know that we are meeting with people from the Division of Air Quality to come up with alternatives in lieu of Emissions Testing, but I want to just do two things formally right now. I first want to put on the record an opinion from the Cache County Attorney that says that the Division of Air Quality and the Air Quality Board does not have the authority to put a nuisance testing on the SIP without Cache County agreeing to that. I want to make sure that that is part of the Public Record. And I realize, and I wasn't here to see it, I got called out of the meeting, but I realize that at one point in time, I myself said that I thought that we needed to have an emissions testing program as part of the SIP. That was really before I knew all of the facts and so I want to take just a minute. I promise not to take more than 5 minutes, but I'm going to just read these comments and then I'll give them to you. I just put Public Comments submitted by M Lynn Lemon . I oppose Emissions Testing for the following reasons,

1. Cache County would see less than a 5% reduction in NOX and less than 6% reduction in VOC during red air days that is between 2.4 and 3.6 tons of NOX and 2.2 to 2.3 tons of VOC .

2. It is unfair to require Cache County to implement an emissions testing and not require Franklin County, which shares the same Air Shed, or Box Elder County to do the same thing.

3. If emissions testing was required, diesel vehicles would not be required to be tested. It is unfair to not require the dirtiest vehicles to be tested.

4. The air quality problems will correct themselves within a 5-year period of time. During the work group meetings, we were told that if we didn't do anything, Cache County would be in compliance by 2019. It does not make economic sense to implement a program with such a short life. Five years ago, the average micrograms per cubic meter was around 12. Today that number is around 9. It will continue to decline with cleaner technology.

5. Emission testing hurts those who can least afford it. They generally have the oldest vehicles which might not pass the emissions test. They would be required to expend far more than the cost of emissions tests to bring their vehicles into compliance.

6. It will not prevent red air days. Red air days are weather related and with emission testing, we will still have red air days. Our focus should be on reducing pollution during yellow and red air days. The question in my mind is, should we require the citizens of Cache County to spend between a million and a million and a half dollars for a very limited amount of reduction for an average of 10.5 red air days or 15-7 red air days based on others calculations. I would like to just make this part of the record. Thank You.

2. I'm Representative Ronda Menlove, Utah House of Representatives, representing the northern area of Box Elder County and western section of Cache Valley. My primary concern today, and I know that this has been explained to me, that agriculture vehicles are exempted from the emissions testing, but I just want to be on record encouraging that to be kept into place that we're not going to burden seasonal agricultural vehicles with this kind of emission testing requirement. My other concern is encouraging the use of natural gas vehicles. We have natural gas stations here in Cache Valley. These vehicles burn cleaner. They're more environmental friendly and I think that in terms of doing things to encourage clean air, we should be motivating people to make transition through incentives to move to natural gas vehicles and other forms of electrical or other kinds of hybrid vehicles that can reduce emissions there. I would encourage DEQ to look more broadly. Emission's testing is not the only way to reduce problems with vehicle's travel. The other concern I have is about expanding the emissions testing in areas where it is not currently being considered. It's not a great program and people are concerned about it. Let's not just pass it along to other counties. So those are my concerns and I appreciate it. I want to be thanking DAQ for holding the hearings and for listening to the voices of people. Thank you

3. Ray Winn. I appreciate your giving us time here. My thing in life is, how can we make life better for us without mandates from the government. I don't know how many folks are here from agriculture today, but I think they probably noticed we had about another ton of alfalfa per acre this year than we had other years. And that was because we got rid of the snow. I talked to a guy by the name of Ray Cortez, a scientist at Utah State Agriculture. Kind of an old guy, He's almost as old as I am. I got to tell you how you know when you're getting older. My wife come and said KD you didn't tell me it was our Wedding Anniversary yesterday. We both forgot. My thing is the dry farm's forever are putting fertilizer or some product on the snow like the 15th of Feb or

somewhere like that. According to University stats, you melt 7 ½ inches of snow per day by doing that and if you get rid of the snow, you get rid of the inversion, you warm up the ground and then we get rid of our bad air days. And then, the people are happier. About 20 degree warmer temperatures for that month or month and a half, which will save folks in the valley a bit of money on their heating costs and make them happier, be less depression. The agricultural community will make big time dollars in the longer season. We would have as long a season as Tremonton does if we didn't hold this snow in this ice bog. The old thing of taking a picnic cooler and putting ice in it, it'll stay frozen for days. That's the same thing the valley does, we stay frozen because of the cold weather. When the University did their research, they did it on white ash from the University because they used to have a coal boiler up there. But I got looking at that and the compost, the soft drawn cloths, all of these things that the farmer will put on his crops to store it with. If they'd put them on in February instead of when it dries up enough to do it, it would make a big difference to the Valley and then we wouldn't have those red air days. They keep saying we can't get rid of our inversion. We get rid of our snow, we get rid of our inversion. I think that's all I've got to say. Thank you very much.

4. Mark Gibbons: I'd like to thank you for this opportunity. Caution Ray Winn not to put it all on the farmer to get rid of the Red Air Day. I'm President of the Dairy Commissioners of the State. I think my personal concern is every time I hear anything to do with dust control. We fought this nationally last fall or a year ago. The 5-90 rule EPA has come out and said we would not do anything to control dust and my concern is sometimes these things spill over into the ag community. We're very heavily regulated now in dairy and agriculture and I would almost like to see a small slice on your pie scale that identifies agriculture on there and so that you don't have a lot of people come with their concerns saying this sector of the industry is just being ignored. We realize that we participate and contribute to the problem and the solution. That makes us responsible too. As we go forward, I would hope that we would stay away from any kind of California Standard. I just heard it mentioned in here one time: California Standards seem to be non-attainable by California agriculture producers. I've worked with a lot of producers in Western States. It's a terrifying event when you have to look at California Standards. Thank You.

5. Jason Wooden: Thank you. I just had a data point as I was reading through this TSD SIP. I don't see it in there and I think it should be in there. In 2002, USU upgraded their coal fired and oil fired boilers to natural gas. An article in an old newspaper from that time period quotes University Officials as stating that this upgrade would reduce visible particulates that cause haze in the Valley and be reduced from 190 tons each year to 5 tons each year, 30 times less. It'd be reduced 5 times less, so roughly 185 tons a year. If

we were to assume that that reduction occurred over the six coldest months of the year, that would be 1 ton per day of PM. That doesn't particularly say PM2.5, it does say visible particulates. I assume that's PM2.5, PM10. That's 1 ton per day. Interestingly, that's roughly what the yearly reduction for your proposed emissions testing would also yield 167.9 tons per year. It occurs to me that if that reduction in 2002 didn't make any difference in the Valley's air quality. It didn't. This is a graph out in the 2011 DAQ Report. Logan continued to follow the same traits as the rest of the State in PM2.5. It really made no difference when the University reduced it by 180 tons per year. If you look at average Logan wintertime monthly temperatures for that same time period, the PM2.5 and those temperatures mirror each other. They're virtually identical except for in 2008. We can only speculate why that was the case. As was mentioned previously, it's high pressure and snow on the ground that causes these temperatures and their indicator of the PM2.5 readings. I just wanted that point to be included in there. If we already did at one point in the past, reduce it by 185 tons a year, and it didn't make any difference, than 165 tons with emissions testing anything that comes with that expense. I don't expect we're going to see a reduction in PM2.5. It's not going to happen. It's a bigger problem. Thank you.

6. Keith Thompson: I also would like to thank you for the opportunity of a public hearing. A couple concerns I had was, and I understand that you're dealing with Federal Regulations here. But it seems to me like the State could at least tell the Federal Government that they are unreasonable on some of their requests. For example, if I understand it, we are out of compliance only on the red air days, which is a very, I wouldn't say small part, but it's not that many days. Sometime some winters we might have more than other winters. If it's only on those particular stretches where we're out of compliance, I heard it said here, if we do some of these things, we can bring it down. We still have a good chance of being out of compliance and we still got unhealthy air. Another one I wanted to ask the one gentleman there and we ran out of time. I was talking with a mechanic friend and he told me, he was talking with the original plan that the county turned down. This whole thing as far as us having to check the rules and everything in Air Quality is ridiculous. He came from California. First of all, us as private individuals buy the equipment to check these automobiles can be very excessive on our part. He said he's talked with some mechanics and they're going to go out of business before they try to regulate and check some of these cars. Of course there'll be others that will. And then, he says you can get the right testing equipment and 5 years down the road that testing equipment becomes obsolete and then you've got to buy an update. To me, they're forecasting 5 years, we'll become compliant anyway, so here you're making these mechanics buy all this extra equipment to test the cars emissions, you're making the people pay the extra money when 5 years down the road it's

forecasted that the problem will take care of itself. To me there's no sense in this. I appreciate the State's saying we've got to comply with the Federal Government. To me, there's got to be a place somewhere where the State can go and say we've talked to the citizens of the County and they say your requests on this are unreasonable from everything we can look at. That's basically how I feel about it. Thank you.

7. Paul Prendergast: This is the way I feel about it. I am concerned about the poor people. When this is implemented, it's going to cost a lot about the poor people. One thing about what I'm going to say is I do believe that the Government is. All we want is for your health, but what I do believe is that they want more money. This is just a cover up. They say this is for your health, but I'm also concerned. It doesn't make any sense to me that you drive, you're going to have more pollution. OK. When you say OK in 5 years from now and stuff. I think if you drive less and combine your trips and stuff. It makes more sense, if you drive less, you're gonna have less pollution and I believe that we should get rewarded for that. Thank you.

8. John Chevalier: Hi, John Chevalier with Collision Centers of Utah. One of my concerns about increasing our regulations are in my profession, we are controlled about what we can charge by the insurance companies. We can't just say because you make us pay more for VOCs we put in the air, we can't suddenly say, OK, we're going to pass it onto the consumer. The insurance companies look at us and say this is how much we are going to allow you to charge based on pre-dominate rate, so they survey all the shops and they decide what they're going to pay per hour and pay the materials. We're already working on a very low can of that money. We're lacking a whole 50 or 20 % profitability of paying the insurance. We are used to the cost of those materials. So to meet some of those VOC Standards, we're gonna have to buy better spray equipment and better guns and probably go to water base paint, which is more expensive. Therefore you're gonna be looking at taking my 20% profitability probably down 10%. Therefore that charge per ton comes out of somebody's profit. It's either gonna come out of mine or it's gonna come out of the consumers. I can't raise the price to the consumer because of the insurance, therefore, it's gonna come out of my pocket. If it comes out of mine, I have to lay somebody off. I have to cost a job. So, this is an EPA regulation that costs jobs. If it costs money to companies, companies have to do something to compensate. Therefore, if they can't raise their prices, they've got to cut their expenses. By cutting their expenses, they're going to get rid of jobs. That's all I'm saying.

9. B.J. Hall: I was just gonna leave you a paper there. But since I'm here and nobody's speaking up. I'm concerned about air quality and of what I'm a part. How do you

consider a company like mine? 15,000 square foot building. We run 2 gas conveyer dryers and we cure plastisols on t-shirts and other fabrics. How do you determine how much my contribution is to the problem and the how do you figure how do I pay my share? What do I do? Is somebody going to jump on the building and stick a emissions reader in the exhaust? How does that work? I'm concerned about the measuring and the responsibility of individual businesses. That seems to be a pretty difficult thing to do, at least in my area. Thank you

10. Bob Torry. My name is Vaughn Torry. I just terminated my retirement after 4 years in the collision industry. I've seen a lot of changes in the last 40 years. I echo what Mr Chevalier said about the cost factors and the deferring of cost from insurance companies to our ????. The profits dwindle down to lucky to make 5 or 6% profit on a huge investment. The cost of paint booths nearly \$85 to \$100,000 installed in each one.

I'm familiar of what CRV has done in California. I am concerned about pollution. I request an extension of the 2014, at least a few more months before it's passed that date due to the cost involved in changing over. We recently, in the last switched all of the shops that I had over to water born paint. That was a huge learning curve, we lost tremendous amounts of money adapting to water born technology.

I am also concerned with the volume of claims now considering recovery from insurance companies, which we draw 80% of our work from. The volume's down, so consequently volume filled dollars is down, puts net profits down. We're in severe economic terms and who knows what the next 4 years will bring after November 7. That's a big question. So there're a lot of concerns to switch over to spraying equipment. If you get the right guns, a paint technician can invest \$2,000.00. Doesn't sound like a lot of money unless you're a man that has watched your spraying technician's yearly income decline the last 2 or 3 years.

We are at a crossroads in our industry. I think that larger shops will be able to absorb some of this cost. What I see based on the last 40 years is that these restrictions are going to drive out a lot of small independent body shops. We have about 90 people in our group of technicians. So it's a large organization, as I say probably better to absorb some of the cost than the smaller ones. I am concerned about the impact it's going to have on the pollution industry. As Mr. Chevalier said, we cannot raise our rates to absorb additional mandates from the Federal Government or EPA. One thing that concerns me also, as we're talking about this is some time ago, I stood in a dealership and watched a used car manager have a man come in an outside source, independent contractor, if you will, and spray in a parking lot. I watched what he was doing. He was spraying a quarter panel door and a rear body panel rear bumper outside and the spray

was going all over, overspray. He had a man behind him with a propane heater, this was in February, heating the panel up as he sprayed it. I called the Riverdale City Fire Department and they said we can't do anything about it. So I called the EPA in Salt Lake and they said we don't have people to enforce. As I understand it and if my memory serves me correctly, you cannot spray more than 2.5 square feet outside. Does that sound right? I think it's about that. Here he was probably quadruple that area, and I was told by EPA that they don't have people to enforce those kind of infractions. And yet they're gonna burden those and the industry that I come from, the good shops that change air filters regularly that trap particulates, that keep their booths clean, that buy the latest spray equipment, and we have individuals such as that and we're told that there are not people to enforce that. I assure you that the man that was outside spraying kicked out more particulates than we did out of four spray booths in our Ogden Shop. I don't think it's fair, I hate quoting that teenage phrase, "it ain't fair," but there's some inequities in our system and I'd like to see those issues addressed as well as the time line, the deadline extended by another 24 months so this industry can get our hands and???? In a row. Thank you.

11. Stanley Kane: Yes, My name's Stan Kane, I work at Utah State University. I have been employed with this organization for 20 years and was part of the scene that replaced the coal fired boilers with natural gas. I'd like to take up a comment made by a previous member of the public who alleged that the reduction in particulates from the USU did not affect the air quality in the valley. The primary reduction as a result of the change from coal to natural gas was in the PM10. It did not affect PM2.5 because the oxides of nitrogen are actually higher in natural gas than in coal and so it did not really affect PM2.5 at all. Just that clarification.

12. Ronald Munger: Thank you. I'm Ron Munger, resident of Smithfield and faculty member of Utah State University. My area of expertise is Public Health and Epidemiology. So first I'd like to comment on the health effects of PM2.5 in regard to the EPA Regulations. EPA reduction is really a compromise between health interests and also economic and business interests. We know that the health effects of PM2.5 pollution are at very very low levels, in fact my colleagues, Dr Kulong and Dr LaFev this last winter conducted a study in Cache Valley. They drew blood samples on volunteers measuring what we call systematic inflammation. We found that in this winter of one of the lowest recorded levels. Actually there's very technical measures of inflammation, so I think what I want the public to keep in mind is that the regulations really are this compromise. I'd also like to address the issue of fairness. In respect to this, voice my support of vehicle emissions testing as a fair way to address this. It's the largest single rule that would reduce emissions according to the estimates here, 168 tons per year. If

we didn't have this widespread reduction, this would place much more burden on individual businesses to have reductions. We've heard comments from several business owners today about the burdens placed on them. So I think that this vehicle emissions testing is really more of a Democratic way of spreading the burden. Lastly, I'd like to thank the Division of Air Quality for their openness and fairness and the high level of science in addressing this and having public meetings. Thank you very much.

13. Rick Keizer: Thanks for allowing us to offer our viewpoint. However, I just want people to know that I was born and raised in San Francisco Bay area of California and first hand experienced the smog testing, emissions testing that California had and EPA looking at the PM2.5 emissions that we had. There was a lot of comments concerning the really bad days that they recorded that the EPA looked at for PM2.5. Seven % of the worst days are not even counted. I just thought that people should know that the worst days weren't counted. However, California does have these very strict smog requirements, but I've also noticed that they still don't meet their required emission standards. I moved here 4 years ago to go to school and I'm attempting to learn how the process goes and I'm honestly trying to be as as possible. I have a pretty cool teacher in Dr. Martin he has kind of opened up the ???? a lot about air pollution stuff. However, I think more research needs to be done to make sure that implementing vehicle emission standards will do enough to meet these standards. Maybe there have been sufficient done enough, I just don't know about it. However, being from California, they did implement those standards years ago. They still haven't successfully met the standards every year. I went back a couple of years ago and they have what they call "spare the air days" in which you cannot have a fire in your fireplace on certain days. One of the days I went back was on Christmas. They had a spare the air day on Christmas. It was cold outside. That's one of the traditions I love being around the fire with the family and everything. You can't do that without possibly being cited with a ticket. I heard some things when I first came to the meeting last night, maybe they should go ahead and do this, the vehicle emissions because from what it looks like, it will help. I heard some contradictive opinions. I don't know those were just opinions or facts or anything like that. I've been trying to ??? my Professor Dr. Martin to try to inform me on what's going on. I just thought, I'm the type of person that doesn't like having my freedom taken away from me. When I went back to California, a couple of years ago and I was told that I could not have a fire in my Brother's house on Christmas Day, that's impeding on my freedom. The problem needs to be solved. I just think it's very important for all. That needs to have important measures taken to it so freedoms aren't taken away that aren't necessary. I don't think anybody on any side of the line should close their minds or their opinions. Thank you.

14. Kori Moore: Yes, Hi, I'm Corey Moore, I was part of the working process, and my callings today deal with first of all, thanking the Division of Air Quality Board for carrying through with the work process. I think it was very good and we had some great comments from industry and from the pulpit. I think that it was a good way to help us be part of the solution in fixing our problem here. My second comment is support for the inspection, the I&M Program that's proposed and the reason being that the Division of Air Quality did a good job in looking at all the sources that are around. There's not really much more that we can look at as far as areas to reduce without having an unfair economic impact, even to the point of putting small companies and even large companies out of business. An Inspection and Maintenance Program spreads the cost of the redemptions around the entire community, which is also part of the problem. The number of vehicles is also part of the problem. So, I think it implements a solution where the problem originates. Thank you.